



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,334	09/10/2003	Keum-Yong Oh	45454	1873
7590	09/19/2007		EXAMINER	
Peter L. Kendall Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			MENDOZA, JUNIOR O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2609	
			MAIL DATE	
			09/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/658,334	OH, KEUM-YONG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Junior O. Mendoza	2609	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/30/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because the applicant uses the term “Template XSL document” for element 32 on figures 2, 3, and 4; however, a different term is being used throughout the specification of the application. More specifically, the term “XML template document” is being used to describe element 32 on paragraphs [0035] and [0039], which is not the same as the previously mentioned term. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The disclosure is objected to because the applicant uses the term “Stored XSL document” for element 115 on figure 3; however, a different element number is being used in the specification of the application. More specifically, the term “Stored XSL document” is being used to describe elements 115 and 32 on paragraph [0039], which does not match with the drawing. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1, 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sahota et al (Pub No US 2001/0056460). Hereinafter referenced as Sahota.

Regarding claim 1, Sahota discloses a set top box (106), fig 1A, as a receiver for TV (104), such set top box (106) can provide on-screen displays (OSDs) or graphical user interfaces to facilitate interactive services, paragraph [0032], which reads on “electronic program guide (EPG)”. Moreover, Sahota discloses a conversion platform (130) used to create templates as XML data files (208A), fig 2A, which reads on “converting a XML-based EPG into a XML-based EPG template”. Sahota discloses a content harvest and conversion platform (130) connected to a set top box (106) which harvests content on network (102) where it can operate from a syndication server (110) where the set top box (106) operates as a receiver of the XML template, exhibited on fig 2A and paragraph [0035], which reads on “transmitting the XML-based EPG template to a receiver”.

Regarding claim 2, Sahota discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition, Sahota discloses a pattern engine (206) that transforms the XML file into a displayable format, which becomes into a XSL document, where an extensible style sheet transformation application can be used to perform such a transformation, paragraph [0067]; moreover Sahota discloses that a XSL application transforms and translates XML data from one format into another, paragraph [0068] also exhibited on fig 2A, which reads on “the cable company provides a style form relates to the XML-based EPG, through conversion into an XSL”.

Regarding claim 3, Sahota discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), in addition, Sahota discloses that the templates used by the set top box (106) can be stored in a file or a database for later editing, paragraph [0027] also exhibited on fig 2A, which reads on “receiver stores and analyzes the XSL document related to the XML template document”.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by alSafadi et al. (Pub No 2003/0088420). Hereinafter referenced as alSafadi.

Regarding claim 4, alSafadi discloses a residence (102) couple to an external network (112)(For example, a set top box), paragraph [0021], also exhibited on figure 1, which reads on “reception apparatus”. alSafadi discloses a storage device (604), paragraph [0059], also exhibited on figure 6, which reads on “storage unit”. A XML parser, paragraph [0026], used to facilitate XML document manipulations, which reads on “a XML parser”. Moreover alSafadi discloses a processor (602) that communicates

with the display (606) using the set of system buses (605), paragraph [0057], also exhibited on figure 6, which reads on “graphic processor”.

7. Claim 8, 9, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hosoda (Patent No 7,020,839). Hereinafter referenced as Hosoda.

Regarding claim 8, Hosoda discloses that the broadcasting station (1), fig 6, sends as part of the digital transmission data, an extensible markup language XML only document main body, hereinafter referred as XML file, column 3 lines 37 – 61, which reads on “providing an extensible markup language (XML) based EPG template”. Moreover, the broadcasting station (1) sends an extensible style sheet language XSL only style sheet, hereinafter referred as XSL file, also exhibited on figure 6, column 3 lines 37 – 61, which reads on “providing an extensible style sheet language (XSL) based EPG template”. Additionally, the broadcasting station (1) transmits both the XML and the XSL file by means of a broadcasting satellite (5) that sends that data to the receiving station (10), also exhibited on figure 6, column 8 lines 35 - 52, which reads on “transmitting the XSL based EPG and the XML based EPG template to a receiver”. Hosoda discloses a TS decoder (53) that separates the received signal into an AV portion which is send to the AV decoder (54) and a digital transmission data portion, which is composed of a plurality of modules that contain the Electronic Program Guide (EPG), column 16 lines 22 – 39, also disclosed on fig 3 which reads on “decoding the XML based EPG”.

Regarding claim 9, Hosoda discloses everything claim as applied above (See claim 8), in addition Hosoda discloses a user selection prompting means which includes a selection menu item that causes the style sheet (XSL file) to be edited, also exhibited on figure 9, column 6 lines 58 – 59, which reads on “editing the XML based EPG template by using the XSL based EPG template”.

Regarding claim 11, Hosoda discloses everything claim as applied above (See claim 8), Hosoda discloses a control program of broadcast program information such as XML, and since it does not contain a display format to display information on a screen, a style sheet (XSL) should be applied, column 7 lines 1 – 9 also exhibited on figure 15, Moreover, Hosoda discloses a style sheet document for converting a XML instance into a display screen format, column 3 lines 52 – 61, which reads on “displaying contents of the XSL document on a screen”.

Regarding claim 13, Hosoda discloses everything claim as applied above (See claim 8), in addition, Hosoda discloses that one of the objects of his invention is to accomplish an information delivery that satisfies the needs of users, column 5 lines 53 – 58, moreover Hosoda discloses that each user may have a plurality of style sheets (XLS) for one XML document, column 5 lines 16 - 17, which reads on “the XSL document is user specific”.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over alSafadi in view of Hosoda.

Regarding claim 5, Sahota discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 4), in addition, alSafadi discloses a device (600) that includes a processor (602) and a memory (604), exhibited on fig 6, that communicates between each other and to other components using the buses of the device, such device represents a set top box (110 – 4), fig 1, which incorporates an EPG, paragraphs [0057] and [0058], which reads on “storage unit”. However, alSafadi fails to disclose a XSL processor that processes the XSL document. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide XSL processor, as taught by Hosoda.

In a similar field of endeavor Hosoda discloses a contents receiving system and contents receiving method. In addition, Hosoda discloses that the receiving system in his invention parses the XML file, where this document object is converted into a format corresponding to the description of the XSL document by a XSL processor, column 4 lines 31 – 43, which reads on “a XSL processor that processes the XSL document”.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify alSafadi by specifically providing a XSL processor that processes the XSL document, as taught by Hosoda, for the purpose of

using a translator that interprets the XML document and allows the content to be displayed in a way that the user can see and understand.

Regarding claim 6, alSafadi discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), in addition, alSafadi discloses a XML parser that permits extraction of content related information from the EPGs (112), exhibited on fig 1, also a device (600) that represents a set top box (110-4), exhibited on fig 1, communicating with the display unit utilizing system buses (605), exhibited on fig 6, which reads on "The reception apparatus...parsed XML based EPG template... and display-related information is displayed ". However, alSafadi fails to disclose a graphic processor that processes the XML-based EPG template and the XSL document. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a graphic processor, as taught by Hosoda.

In a similar field of endeavor Hosoda discloses a contents receiving system and contents receiving method. In addition, Hosoda discloses the receiving system in his invention parses the XML file, where this document object is converted into a format corresponding to the description of the XSL document by a XSL processor, column 4 lines 31 – 43, which at the same time communicates with a display system (61), exhibited on fig 6.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify alSafadi by specifically providing graphic processor that processes the XML-based EPG template and the XSL document, as taught by Hosoda, for the purpose of using a translator that interprets the XML

document and allows the content to be displayed in a way that the user can see and understand.

Regarding claim 7, alSafadi discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), in addition, alSafadi discloses a memory (604) that stores the EPG techniques implemented in the invention, exhibited on fig 6 paragraphs [0059] and [0060], which reads on “storage unit”. However, alSafadi fails to disclose that there can be various XSL documents related to the same XML-based EPG template document. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide various XSL documents related to the same XML-based EPG template document, as taught by Hosoda.

In a similar field of endeavor Hosoda discloses a contents receiving system and contents receiving method. In addition, Hosoda discloses that each user may have a plurality of style sheets (XSL) for one XML document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify alSafadi by specifically providing various XSL documents related to the same XML-based EPG template document, as taught by Hosoda, for the purpose of increasing the amount of profiles and flexibilities that a user can have.

10. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosoda in view of Bennington et al (Pub No US 2004/0168188). Hereinafter referred as Bennington.

Regarding claim 10, Hosoda discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 9), in addition, Hosoda discloses a user selection prompting means which includes a selection menu item that causes the style sheet (XSL file) to be edited, also exhibited on figure 9, column 6 lines 58 – 59, which reads on “programming from the XML based EPG template”. However, Hosoda fails to disclose that a user can add and delete channels from the EPG. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide the ability for the user to add and delete channels from the EPG, as taught by Bennington.

In a similar field of endeavor Bennington discloses an electronic television program guide schedule system and method. In addition, Bennington discloses that the user can select or delete channels from the viewer preferences list in any desired order.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hosoda by specifically providing the ability for the user to add and delete channels from the EPG, as taught by Bennington, for the purpose of giving more freedom to the user to customize their electronic program guide.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosoda in view of Tang et al (Pub No US 2005/0254448). Hereinafter referred as Tang.

Regarding claim 12, Hosoda discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 8), in addition, Hosoda discloses that each XML document is accompanied by a style sheet XSL document, a document object as a parsed result is sent to a XSL processor, and such document object is a structure document of which a tree is structured with tags, column 15 lines 42 - 54, which reads on “merging the XML and XSL EPG”. However, Hosoda fails to disclose “A single path tree to access a node”. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a single path tree to access a node, as taught by Tang.

In a similar field of endeavor Tang discloses a distribution scheme for distribution information in a network. In addition, Tang discloses a spanning tree used for distributing packets which follow the shortest routing path, paragraph [0047], which reads on “single path tree to access a node”.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hosoda by specifically providing single path tree to access a node, as taught by Tang, for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of a device by selecting the single best route to each destination where data is being send .

12. Claim 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosoda in view of Klarfeld et al (Pub No US 2003/0067554). Hereinafter referred as Klarfeld.

Regarding claim 14, Hosoda discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 8), in addition, Hosoda discloses that the broadcast program information is

Art Unit: 2609

displayed on a particular area of the screen, column 19 lines 14 – 20 also exhibited on fig 10, which reads on “program feature”. However, Hosoda fails to disclose viewer feature. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide viewer feature, as taught by Klarfeld.

In a similar field of endeavor Klarfeld discloses a system and method for personalized TV. In addition, Klarfeld discloses television-viewing habits of the population, which may include race, age, annual income, etc, paragraph [0087].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hosoda by specifically providing a viewer feature, as taught by Klarfeld, for the purpose of providing more information to the viewer so they can make a better decision on what to watch.

Regarding claim 16, Hosoda discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 14), in addition, Hosoda discloses that the broadcast program information is displayed on a particular area of the screen, column 19 lines 14 – 20 also exhibited on fig 10, which reads on “feature”. However, Hosoda fails to disclose viewer feature. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide viewer feature, as taught by Klarfeld.

In a similar field of endeavor Klarfeld discloses a system and method for personalized TV. In addition, Klarfeld discloses television-viewing habits of the population, which may include race, age, annual income, etc. moreover the viewer

behavior database contains information about all the television programs each viewer watched during a certain period, paragraph [0087].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hosoda by specifically providing a viewer feature, as taught by Klarfeld, for the purpose of providing more information to the viewer so they can make a better decision on what to watch, comparing his characteristics to the characteristics of other people watching the same program.

13. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosoda in view of Clancy et al (Pub No US 2004/0002987). Hereinafter referred as Clancy.

Regarding claim 15, Hosoda discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim14), in addition, Hosoda discloses that the broadcast program information is displayed on a particular area of the screen, column 19 lines 14 – 20 also exhibited on fig 10, which reads on “program feature”. However, Hosoda fails to disclose a program start time, a program end time, a program title and a program type. However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art to provide a program start time, a program end time, a program title and a program type, as taught by Clancy.

In a similar field of endeavor Clancy discloses a Dynamic electronic program guide. In addition, Clancy discloses a program data provider that includes an EPG database and a EPG server, which includes program title, rating, characters, descriptions, schedule information and so on

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hosoda by specifically providing element, as taught by Clancy, for the purpose of providing extra information to the viewer with respect to the schedule of the listings and the type of program they are showing.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junior O. Mendoza whose telephone number is 571-270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8am - 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
JEFFEREY F. HAROLD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

  
Junior O Mendoza  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2609

JM JM  
August 9, 2007